

Amendment dated July 9, 2010
Reply to Office Action of January 21, 2010

21. (new): An input device which includes an orifice which orifice is an aperture in said input device which input device is for measuring the degree of penetration of an object into said orifice where said object causes displacement of a substance in said input device which input device further comprises processing circuitry which circuitry causes output of digital electronic data for transmission, storage, and processing in computers that may be attached to said input device which electronic data relates to the degree of penetration of said object into said orifice.

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS The present amendment is submitted in an earnest effort to advance the case to issue without delay.

Claims 6-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. The claims were identified as means-plus-function limited claims. The specification/written description was said to fail in clearly linking or associating the disclosed structure, material or acts to the claimed function such that one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize what structure, material or act perform the claimed function.

Applicant has amended the claims to remove means-plus-function language. The amendment to the claims was not necessitated by the prior art but merely to remove the informality of the means-plus-function language.

Claims 6-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by Hovland et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,169,914). Applicant traverses this rejection.

Anticipation requires that all elements of a claim be found in a single prior art reference. Contrary to Hovland, Applicant's new independent Claim 11 has multiple features not found in the reference.

Claim 11 requires a first tube and a second tube at the local station, the tubes communicating with one another through a pneumatic fluid. These features are not shown in the reference. Further, Claim 11 requires a piston in the second tube. This is absent from the reference. Still further, Claim 11 requires a motor at the remote station. This is absent from the reference. Still further, Claim 11 requires a thrusting tube positioned inside a steadying tube. The reference fails to show this combination. Neither does the

Appl. No. 10/670,030

Amendment dated July 9, 2010

Reply to Office Action of January 21, 2010

reference disclose the motor energizing movement of the thrusting tube. The reference is not motorized but requires human power as input. For all these reasons, Hovland et al. would not anticipate the claims.

Claim 21 describes a device containing an aperture for receiving an object where data is generated that is related to the degree of penetration of the object into this aperture. This device is specific to the use by a male, not female user as it receives an object and measures the movement of this object and as such was clearly not anticipated by Hovland.

In view of the foregoing amendment and comments, Applicant requests the Examiner to reconsider the rejection and now allow the claims.

Dated: July 9, 2010 Respectfully submitted,

By: Vivien Cambridge

3094 Howard Ave, Suite 207

Myrtle Beach, SC 20577

Tel: (843) 839-2446

vcambri01@aol.com